



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/754,556	01/04/2001	Kim Toll	INTL-0529-US (P10829)	3715
45209	7590	12/08/2005	EXAMINER	
INTEL/BLAKELY 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			BARNES, CRYSTAL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2121	

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/754,556	Applicant(s) TOLL ET AL.	
	Examiner Crystal J. Barnes	Art Unit 2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-17 and 19-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-17 and 19-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a second Non-Final Office Action in response to the Amendment After Final received on 16 November 2005. Claims 7 and 18 have been cancelled. Claims 30-33 have been added. Claims 1-6, 8-17 and 19-33 are now pending in this application.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-6, 8-17 and 19-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,310,889 B1 to Parsons et al.

As per claim 1, the Parsons et al. reference discloses a method comprising:
storing a user profile (see column 9 lines 32-33, "personal agent 80") for each of a

plurality of users on a first processor-based system (see figure 3 and column 3 lines 39-41, "home host 32a"); and automatically creating a version (see column 9 lines 37-40, "replicated") of the profile ("replicated personal agent 80r") for use on the second processor-based system ("remote host 32b, client 40").

As per claim 2, the Parsons et al. reference discloses automatically creating a version of the profile ("replicated personal agent 80r") in response to the user logging on (see column 5 lines 20-23, "inputting a user ID and password") to the first processor-based system ("home host 32a").

As per claim 3, the Parsons et al. reference discloses automatically creating a version of the profile ("replicated personal agent 80r") for use on a portable processor-based system (see column 4 lines 29-34, "clients 40").

As per claim 4, the Parsons et al. reference discloses automatically compiling a version of a user profile ("replicated personal agent 80r") for a web browser session (see column 4 lines 60-65, "WEB browser") and storing said profile (see column 10 lines 5-14, "updates transmitted to master personal agent 80") at the end of said web browser session ("network connection").

As per claim 5, the Parsons et al. reference discloses receiving an updated user profile (see column 10 lines 25-28, "master personal agent 80 can be updated") from the second processor-based system ("remote host 32b, client 40").

As per claim 6, the Parsons et al. reference discloses a method comprising: storing a profile (see column 9 lines 37-40, "replicated personal agent 80r") for the current user of a second processor-based system ("remote host 32b"); updating said profile (see column 10 lines 5-14, "updates transmitted to master personal agent 80") based on the current user's activities (see column 10 lines 3-5, "reading, replying, deleting and creating various messages") on the second processor-based system ("remote host 32b, client 40"); and automatically forwarding the updated profile ("updates transmitted") to a first processor-based system ("home host 32a"); and automatically forwarding ("updates transmitted") the profile ("any changes") from the second processor-based system ("remote host 32b, client 40") to the first processor-based system ("home host 32a") before powering down ("network connection") the second processor-based system ("remote host 32b, client 40").

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated and further claim 8 contains limitations recited in claim 4; therefore claim 8 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4.

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further claim 9 contains limitations recited in claim 1; therefore claim 9 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further claim 10 contains limitations recited in claim 2; therefore claim 10 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated and further claim 11 contains limitations recited in claim 6; therefore claim 11 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 6.

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further claim 12 contains limitations recited in claim 1; therefore claim 12 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further claim 13 contains limitations recited in claim 2; therefore claim 13 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

As per claim 14, the rejection of claims 2 and 4 are incorporated and further claim 14 contains limitations recited in claims 2 and 4; therefore claim 14 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 2 and 4.

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated and further claim 15 contains limitations recited in claim 4; therefore claim 15 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4.

As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and further claim 16 contains limitations recited in claim 5; therefore claim 16 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

As per claim 17, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated and further claim 17 contains limitations recited in claim 6; therefore claim 17 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 6.

As per claim 19, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and further claim 19 contains limitations recited in claim 8; therefore claim 19 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 8.

As per claim 20, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further claim 20 contains limitations recited in claim 9; therefore claim 20 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9.

As per claim 21, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and further claim 21 contains limitations recited in claim 10; therefore claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10.

As per claim 22, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and further claim 22 contains limitations recited in claim 11; therefore claim 22 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11.

As per claim 23, the Parsons et al. reference discloses a system comprising: a processor (see column 3 lines 29-31, "region manager 22, region server 24"); and a storage (see column 4 lines 35-45, "database engine 38") coupled to the processor ("region manager 22, region server 24"), the storage ("database engine 38") storing instructions ("agents") that enable the processor ("region manager 22, region server 24") to store a web browser profile (see column 4 lines 60-65, "WEB browser") for each of the plurality of users (see column 4 lines 29-34, "clients 40") of the system and automatically provide the web browser profile ("WEB browser") for a user to a second processor-based system (see column 9 lines 37-40, "remote host 32b, client 40").

As per claim 24, the Parsons et al. reference discloses a wireless interface (see column 3 lines 39-44, "wireless services") to communicate with the second processor-based system (see column 4 lines 46-49, "client 40, remote host 32b").

As per claim 25, the Parsons et al. reference discloses a system comprising: a processor (see column 3 lines 29-31, "region manager 22, region server 24"); and a storage (see column 4 lines 35-45, "database engine 38") coupled to the processor ("region manager 22, region server 24"), the storage ("database engine 38") storing instructions ("agents") that enable the processor ("region manager 22, region server 24") to store a web browser profile (see column 4 lines 60-65, "WEB browser") for the current user of system; update the profile (see column 10 lines 5-14, "updates transmitted to master personal agent 80") based on the current user's activities (see column 10 lines 3-5, "reading, replying, deleting and creating various messages") on the system; and automatically forward the updated profile ("updates transmitted") to a second processor-based system ("home host 32a").

As per claim 26, the Parsons et al. reference discloses said system is a battery-powered system (see column 4 lines 28-37, "cellular or PCS handsets, pagers, PDAs").

As per claim 27, the rejection of claim 24 is incorporated and further claim 27 contains limitations recited in claim 24; therefore claim 27 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 24.

As per claim 28, the Parsons et al. reference discloses said storage ("database engine 38") stores instructions ("agents") that enable the processor ("region manager 22, region server 24") to automatically compile a web browser profile ("WEB browser") based on activities of the user ("reading, replying, deleting and creating various messages") on the system.

As per claim 29, the Parsons et al. reference discloses said storage ("database engine 38") stores instructions ("agents") that enable the processor ("region manager 22, region server 24") to automatically transmit ("updates transmitted") said web browser profile ("any changes") to the second processor-based system ("remote host 32b, client 40") in response to a command to power down ("network connection") the second processor-based system ("remote host 32b, client 40").

As per claim 30, the Parsons et al. reference discloses the portable processor-based system ("clients 40") runs a set of applications (see column 4 lines

60-65, "digital voice telephone, analog voice telephone, WEB browser") not present on the first processor-based system ("home host 32a").

As per claim 31, the Parsons et al. reference discloses further comprising, a plurality of manually selectable user identification input components (see column 4 lines 53-62, "clients 40") coupled to the second processor-based system ("region server 24, host 32") to select a user profile (see column 6 lines 51-53, "user profile") for recall upon power on ("completed connection") of the second processor-based system ("region server 24, host 32").

As per claim 32, the rejection of claim 31 is incorporated and further claim 32 contains limitations recited in claim 31; therefore claim 32 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 31.

As per claim 33, the rejection of claim 31 is incorporated and further claim 33 contains limitations recited in claim 31; therefore claim 33 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 31.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks page 8, filed 16 November 2005, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-29 under 35 USC 102(e) have been fully

considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejections have been withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of USPN 6,310,889 B1 to Parsons et al.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following references are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to synchronizing client/server applications in general:

USPN 6,684,217 B1 to Schneider

USPN 6,662,012 B1 to Do

USPN 6,633,977 B1 to Hamilton, II et al.

USPN 6,182,212 B1 to Atkins et al.

USPN 5,600,781 to Root et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Crystal J. Barnes whose telephone number is

571.272.3679. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday alternate Mondays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on 571.272.3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CJB
1 December 2005


Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600